



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/083,121	02/27/2002	Hiroshi Tsuda	826.1792	3398
79326	7590	07/09/2009		
Fujitsu Patent Center C/O CPA Global P.O. Box 52050 Minneapolis, MN 55402			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, CINDY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
07/09/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/083,121	Applicant(s) TSUDA, HIROSHI
	Examiner CINDY NGUYEN	Art Unit 2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-3,6-9,22-26,28-30,33,34,37-39 and 54 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-3, 6-9, 22-26, 28-30, 33-34, 37-39 and 54 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/21/09.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This is response to amendment filed 04/20/09.

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 04/21/09 is being considered by the examiner.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 6-9, 22-26, 28-30, 33, 34, 37, 38, 39 and 54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bates et al. (US 6088707, hereafter as Bates) in view of Altschuler et al. (US 6195622, hereafter Altschuler).

Regarding claims 1 and 26, Bates discloses: a popularity degree calculation method and a computer-readable storage medium (23, fig. 1) that stores a program, for calculating a popularity degree indicating the height of a popularity of a document in a network via an apparatus connected with the network (see col. 5, lines 2-8), comprising:

extracting the document updated or newly collected during a first time period (i.e., update status information is maintained for documents that have been previously visited by a user, see col. 6, lines 3-5, lines 24-25, lines 30-35; identify the last known state of the document, information regarding the contents of the documents as the last time the document was visited, lines 44-48, Bates);

calculating the popularity degree for one of the extracted documents during the first time period (see col. 6, lines 52-57, Bates);

extracting a popularity degree from the calculated popularity degree during a second time period (see col. 6, lines 52-57; col. 7, lines 23-40; col. 7, lines 65 to col. 8, lines 3; col. 9, lines 11-22, Bates);

calculating a popularity degree indicating how the popularity degree of each of the documents varies as time elapses (i.e., determination as to whether or not a document has been updated/popularity is performed by maintaining a checksum value for the document and comparing the value to a previously calculated checksum for the document... calculates the checksum and updates the reference data for the document with its value...for example, a time stamp may be stored in a document, whereby an update would be indicated by a more

Art Unit: 2161

current time stamp in the document than that stored in the reference data....see col. 13, lines 12-40, lines 51-56).

However, Bates doesn't teach calculating a popularity transition degree indicating how the popularity degree of each of the documents varies as time elapses by both a direction and a degree of transition of the popularity degree for each of the extracted documents based on the popularity degree during the first time period and the second time period. On the other hand, Altschuler teach the transition probability determine the probability that a user which consumed or requested (both direction) one resource/document see col. 9, lines 47-50; col. 10, lines 8-17). Thus, at the time invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include probabilities transition in the system of Bates as taught by Altschuler. The motivation being for using transition probability to prefetch resources.

Regarding claim 2, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Bates discloses: wherein the popularity degree is calculated based on both a link relation of each of the extracted documents and document location information indicating a location in the network of each of the documents (see col. 10, lines 33-43).

Regarding claim 3, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 2 above. In addition Bates/ Horvitz discloses: wherein the popularity degree is calculated based on features of a character string describing the document location information (see 11, lines 1-8, Bates).

Art Unit: 2161

Regarding claims 6, and 28, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1 and 26 above. In addition, Bates/ Horvitz discloses: further comprising: calculating a regression equation against a time of the popularity degree calculated during the second time period (see paragraph 0079, Bates).

Regarding claims 7 and 29, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 6, and 28 above. In addition, Bates discloses: wherein the popularity transition degree is calculated based on a regression coefficient of the regression equation (see col. 18, lines 14-25, Bates).

Regarding claims 8 and 30, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 7 and 29 above. In addition, Bates discloses: further comprising determining transition tendency against the time of the popularity degree, based on an intercept of the regression equation (see col. 18, lines 14-25, and fig. 21A, 422, 428, 429, 433, 432 Bates).

Regarding claim 9, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 6 above. In addition, Bates discloses: further comprising: determining an order of each document in the extracted documents, based on the popularity degree calculated during the second time period (see col. 13, lines 30-40, Bates).

Regarding claim 22, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. In addition, Bates discloses: extracting a tag that is contained in each of the extracted documents and designates user input (see col. 11, lines 35-39, Bates). However, Bates didn't disclose: judging the type of the service provided by each of the documents, based on the tag that designates user input (see col. 11, lines 48-56, Bates).

Regarding claim 23, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 22 above. In addition, Bates discloses: further comprising: determining that the document provides no service, if the document includes no tag designating user input (see col. 12, lines 8-14, Bates).

Regarding claim 24, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 22 above. In addition, Bates discloses: wherein the service type provided by the document is judged based on the description of a button included in the document (see col. 9, lines 45-50, Bates).

Regarding claim 25, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 22 above. In addition, Bates/ Horvitz discloses: wherein the service type provided by the document is judged based on a user input area included in the document (see col. 9, lines 60-67, Bates).

Regarding claim 33, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. It is therefore rejected as set forth above. In addition, Bates/Altscheler discloses: collecting documents from the network (see col. 13, lines 62-65, Bates); retrieving the document meeting retrieval conditions from the collected documents, based on the retrieval conditions (see col. 14, lines 3-16, Bates); ranking the retrieved documents, based on the popularity degree (i.e., see col. 31, lines 29-33, Altscheler); and outputting information about the retrieved documents, based on the ranking result (i.e., see col. 31, lines 29-33, Altscheler);

Regarding claim 34, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 33 above. In addition, Bates discloses: adding information about the popularity transition degree to information about the retrieved documents (see col. 8, lines 25-31, Bates).

Regarding claim 37, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 23-25 and 33. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

Regarding claim 38, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 33 above. In addition, Bates discloses: receiving from a user registration of both document location information indicating location in the network of a specific document and a value (see col. 20, lines 13-30, Bates);

Art Unit: 2161

notifying the user of the fact that a popularity degree has reached the value (see col. 20, lines 23-30), when the popularity degree for the document specified by the document location information has reached the value (see col. 20, lines 13-30, Bates).

Regarding claim 39, all the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 1, 26 and 33. In addition, Bates/ Altscheler discloses: retrieving the document meeting retrieval conditions from the collected documents based on the retrieval conditions (see col. 17, lines 21-27, Bates); ranking the retrieved documents, based on the popularity degree and outputting information about the retrieved documents, based on the ranking result (i.e., see col. 31, lines 29-33, Altscheler).

Regarding claim 54, all the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claims 33 and 38. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is

Art Unit: 2161

filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cindy Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4025. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2161

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 2161

/Etienne P LeRoux/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2161